UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/663,474	09/15/2003	Kenneth W. Shirriff	15437-0641	3748

45657 7590 11/08/2007	**EXAMINER**
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER, LLP	GILLIS, BRIAN J
AND SUN MICROSYSTEMS, INC.	

2055 GATEWAY PLACE	ART UNIT / PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 550	2141
SAN JOSE, CA 95110-1089	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/08/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

	Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/663,474	Applicant(s) SHIRRIFF ET AL.
		Examiner Brian J. Gillis	Art Unit 2141	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 August 2007*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-26 and 45-60* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-26 and 45-60* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *15 September 2003* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 23, 45, and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly

claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 23 recites the limitation "said remote event buffer" in lines 1-2.

There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 45 recites the limitation "the graphic display" in line 12. There is

insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 53 recites the limitation "the graphic display" in lines 11-12. There

is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

As for claims 46-52 and 54-60 which claim dependency from independent

claims 45 and 53, these claims are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second

paragraph for insufficient antecedent basis per the rational of claims 45 and 53.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35

U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this

Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section
122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or
(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before
the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under

the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 45-49, 52-57 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736).

(Claim 45 discloses) A machine-implemented method, comprising: obtaining, from a server, a set of status information pertaining to one or more components (Chen et al shows a server obtains event information (paragraph 21).); rendering a display to show the status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the administrative workstation displays the event information (paragraph 22).); accessing an event buffer, wherein the event buffer stores one or more events pertaining to the one or more components (Chen et al shows a database stores information about the events (paragraph 21).); determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that require the display to be updated (Chen et al shows after an event is detected it is determined if it is an event to be displayed (paragraph 22).); in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events that require the graphic display to be updated, obtaining from the server a set of updated status information pertaining to the one or more components (Chen et al shows the event is obtained from the server and displayed by the administrative workstation (paragraph 22).); and rendering an updated display to show the updated status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the display is updated (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 46 discloses) the method of claim 45, wherein the one or more components are one or more nodes in a cluster of nodes (Chen et al shows a plurality of network devices or nodes are connected to the network (paragraph 19)).

(Claim 47 discloses) the method of claim 45, wherein the server is a web server, and wherein obtaining the set of status information comprises: loading a web page from the web server that includes the status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the event information is displayed on a web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 48 discloses) the method of claim 47, wherein obtaining the set of updated status information comprises: loading an updated web page from the web server that includes the updated status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the updated event information is updated on the web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 49 discloses) the method of claim 47, wherein loading the web page comprises: registering a set of one or more pertinent events as events that require the display to be updated (Chen et al shows the event is determined whether to be displayed on the web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 52 discloses) the method of claim 49, wherein determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that require the display to be updated comprises: determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events (Chen et al shows a new event is detected in the database (paragraphs 21 and 22).); and in response to a determination that the event

buffer contains one or more newly added events, determining whether any of the

one or more newly added events is one of the events in the set of one or more

pertinent events (Chen et al shows if a new event is needed to be displayed it is

a pertinent event (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 53 discloses) An apparatus, comprising: means for obtaining, from

a server, a set of status information pertaining to one or more components (Chen

et al shows a server obtains event information (paragraph 21).); means for

rendering a display to show the status information for the one or more

components (Chen et al shows the administrative workstation displays the event

information (paragraph 22).); means for accessing an event buffer, wherein the

event buffer stores one or more events pertaining to the one or more

components (Chen et al shows a database stores information about the events

(paragraph 21).); means for determining whether the event buffer contains any

newly added events that require the display to be updated (Chen et al shows

after an event is detected it is determined if it is an event to be displayed

(paragraph 22).); means for obtaining from the server, in response to a

determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly added events that

require the graphic display to be updated, a set of updated status information

pertaining to the one or more components (Chen et al shows the event is

obtained from the server and displayed by the administrative workstation

(paragraph 22).); and means for rendering an updated display to show the

updated status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows

the display is updated (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 54 discloses) the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the one or more components are one or more nodes in a cluster of nodes (Chen et al shows a plurality of network devices or nodes are connected to the network (paragraph 19)).

(Claim 55 discloses) the apparatus of claim 53, wherein the server is a web server, and wherein the means for obtaining the set of status information comprises: means for loading a web page from the web server that includes the status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the event information is displayed on a web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 56 discloses) the apparatus of claim 55, wherein the means for obtaining the set of updated status information comprised: means for loading an updated web page from the web server that includes the updated status information for the one or more components (Chen et al shows the updated event information is updated on the web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 57 discloses) the apparatus of claim 55, wherein the means for loading the web page comprises: means for registering a set of one or more pertinent events as events that require the display to be updated (Chen et al shows the event is determined whether to be displayed on the web page (paragraph 22)).

(Claim 60 discloses) The apparatus of claim 57, wherein the means for determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events that require the display to be updated comprises: means for determining whether the event buffer contains any newly added events (Chen et al shows a new event is

detected in the database (paragraphs 21 and 22).); and means for determining,

in response to a determination that the event buffer contains one or more newly

added events, whether any of the one or more newly added events is one of the

events in the set of one or more pertinent events (Chen et al shows if a new

event is needed to be displayed it is a pertinent event (paragraph 22)).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for

all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described
> as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to
> be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been
> obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which
> said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the
> invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering

patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that

the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any

inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary.

Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor

and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a

later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of

35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35

U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 26, 7, 11-13, 17-20, 22, 23, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.

103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of

Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736).

Claim 1 discloses a system for event notification, comprising: an event

buffer; a first node, the first node detecting a situation of interest on the first node

and generating a first event in response thereto, the first node sending

information pertaining to the first event to the event buffer to be stored therein;

and a remote computing system, the remote computing system displaying a first

set of status information for the first node that was previously obtained from a

server, the remote computing system polling the event buffer for new events and

in response to detecting the first event, the remote computing system interacting

again with the server to obtain therefrom a set of updated status information for

the first node, the remote computing system thereafter displaying the updated

status information. Royce et al teaches detecting an event which triggers a

notice to be generated and transmitted (column 4, lines 25-35) and the outboard

console personal computer (OBCP) receives the event notice and transmits the

notice (column 4, lines 37-41). It fails to teach an event buffer and a remote

computing system, the remote computing system displaying a first set of status

information for the first node that was previously obtained from a server, the

remote computing system polling the event buffer for new events and in

response to detecting the first event, the remote computing system interacting

again with the server to obtain therefrom a set of updated status information for

the first node, the remote computing system thereafter displaying the updated

status information. Chen et al teaches a database is used to store event

information (paragraph 21), and an administrative workstation obtains the event

information and if a new event is detected and determined to be displayed the event is displayed (paragraphs 21 and 22).

Royce et al and Chen et al are analogous art because they are both related to event notification.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the computing system features in Chen et al with the system in Royce et al because relevant events are able to be monitored remotely and information is displayed in real time (Chen, paragraph 9).

Claim 2 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 wherein the event buffer comprises a database for storing received events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21).

Claim 6 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 further comprising: a second node, the second node detecting a situation of interest on the second node and generating a second event in response thereto, the second node sending information pertaining to the second event to the event buffer to be stored therein. Royce et al further teaches multiple nodes, which detects an event, which triggers a notice, to be generated and transmitted (figure 2, column 4, lines 25-35) and the OBCP receives the event notice and transmits the notice (column 4, lines 37-41).

Claim 7 discloses the system for event notification of claim 6 wherein the event buffer comprises a database for storing received events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21).

Claim 11 discloses the system for event notification of claim 6 wherein the second node comprises a second event buffer, and wherein the second event buffer receives events transmitted from at least one of the first node and the second node. Royce et al further teaches the system can have multiple devices monitoring (figure 2).

Claim 12 discloses the system for event notification of claim 11 wherein the event buffer comprises a first list of significant events and wherein the second event buffer comprises a second list of significant events. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a buffer (paragraph 21).

Claim 13 discloses the system for event notification of claim 1 wherein the remote computing system renders a graphic display to show the first set of status information and/or the updated status information. Chen et al further teaches the display is a graphic display (figure 7, paragraph 28).

Claim 17 discloses the system for event notification of claim 13 wherein the graphic display is rendered by an application that is integrated with at least one of an event monitor, and the event buffer. Chen et al further teaches the event-setting module is integrated with a database (paragraphs 21 and 23).

Claim 18 discloses a network for event notification, comprising: an event forwarding mechanism in each node of a cluster for forwarding detected events to each other node; an event buffer of said cluster to receive and store each event forwarded from a node from an event forwarding mechanism; and a remote event monitor for periodically polling said event buffer for changes in pertinent events, and in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events, the

remote event monitor causing updated status information pertaining to one or

more nodes in said cluster to be obtained from a server and causing the updated

status information to be displayed. Royce et al teaches the OBCP receives an

event notice and transmits the notice through the network (column 4, lines 37-

41). It fails to teach an event buffer of said cluster to receive and store each

event forwarded from a node from an event forwarding mechanism; and a remote

event monitor for periodically polling said event buffer for changes in pertinent

events, and in response to detecting one or more new pertinent events, the

remote event monitor causing updated status information pertaining to one or

more nodes in said cluster to be obtained from a server and causing the updated

status information to be displayed. Chen et al teaches storing the events by the

obtaining module (paragraph 21) and an administrative workstation obtains the

event information and if a new event is detected and determined to be displayed

the event is displayed (paragraphs 21 and 22).

Royce et al and Chen et al are analogous art because they are both

related to event notification.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to use the computing system features in Chen et al with

the system in Royce et al because relevant events are able to be monitored

remotely and information is displayed in real time (Chen, paragraph 9).

Claim 19 discloses the network of claim 18 further comprising: an event

generation mechanism in each node to generate an event when something of

interest occurs within said cluster. Royce et al further teaches detecting an event,

which triggers an event notice, which is transmitted to the OBCP (column 4, lines 25-35).

Claim 20 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said updated status information is displayed within a web page. Chen et al further teaches the display is a web page (paragraph 21).

Claim 22 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said remote event monitor resides within a browser system. Chen et al further teaches the administrative work station is a browser system (paragraph 26).

Claim 23 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said remote event buffer is located on at least one node in a cluster. Chen et al further teaches the database is stored on the administrative workstation (paragraph 21).

Claim 25 discloses the network of claim 20 wherein said web page registers pertinent events with said remote event monitor. Chen et al further teaches the pertinent events can be determined using the web page (paragraph 26).

Claims 3-5, 8-10, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736) as applied to claims 1, and 18 above, and further in view of Labovitz et al (US PGPUB US 2003/0037136).

Claim 3 discloses the system for event notification of claim 2 wherein the database is pruned. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 2 as recited above. It fails to teach the database being pruned. Labovitz et al teaches the database is pruned (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claim 4 discloses the system for event notification of claim 3 wherein the pruning is carried out at timed intervals. Labovitz et al further teaches the database is pruned periodically (paragraph 127).

Claim 5 discloses the system for event notification of claim 4 wherein the pruning is carried out at said time intervals of between 2 and 120 seconds. Labovitz et al further teaches the frequency the database is pruned is configurable (paragraph 127).

Claim 8 discloses the system for event notification of claim 7 wherein the database is pruned. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 7 as recited above. It fails to teach the database being pruned. Labovitz et al teaches the database is pruned (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claim 9 discloses the system for event notification of claim 8 wherein the pruning is carried out at timed intervals. Labovitz et al further teaches the database is pruned periodically (paragraph 127).

Claim 10 discloses the system for event notification of claim 9 wherein the pruning is carried out at said time intervals of between 2 and 120 seconds. Labovitz et al further teaches the frequency the database is pruned is configurable (paragraph 127).

Claim 21 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said event buffer further comprises: a database for storing events received from said event forwarding mechanisms; and an evictor for periodically removing events from said database. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. Chen et al further teaches the events are stored in a database (paragraph 21). It fails to teach an evictor for periodically removing events from said database. Labovitz et al teaches pruning the database periodically (paragraph 127).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Labovitz et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the pruning feature in Labovitz et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because old information is removed reducing the storage requirement (Labovitz, paragraph 127).

Claims 14-16, and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US

PGPUB US2004/0119736) as applied to claims 1, and 18 above, and further in view of Heidingsfeld et al (US Patent #6,823,359).

Claim 14 discloses the system for event notification of claim 13 wherein the graphic display is rendered by a stand-alone application. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 13 as recited above. It fails to teach the graphic display is a stand-alone application. Heidingsfeld et al teaches the display is a stand-alone application (column 5, lines 37-43).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the display stand-alone feature in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 15 discloses the system for event notification of claim 13 wherein the graphic display is a web page rendered by a web browser. Chen et al further teaches the display is on a web page (paragraph 21).

Claim 16 discloses the system for event notification of claim 15 wherein the web browser comprises plug-ins. Heidingsfeld et al further teaches the web browser comprises plug-ins (figure 7).

Claim 26 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said updated status information is displayed in a frame of a displayed web page. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 18 as recited above. It fails to teach

the information is in a frame of a displayed web page. Heidingsfeld et al teaches

updating a frame of a web page (column 5, lines 50-64).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art

because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to use the frame updating feature in Heidingsfeld et al with

the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because the data is able to be

delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1,

line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Royce et al (US Patent #5,748,884) in view of Chen et al (US PGPUB

US2004/0119736) as applied to claim 18 above, and further in view of Villado et

al (US PGPUB US2004/0111507).

Claim 24 discloses the network of claim 18 wherein said remote event

monitor is a Java applet operating on a computing system remote from said

cluster. Royce et al in view of Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 18 as

recited above. It fails to teach the remote event monitor being a Java applet

operating on a computing system remote from said cluster. Villado et al teaches

the monitoring may be implemented using JAVA remotely (paragraph 63).

Royce et al in view of Chen et al and Villado et al are analogous art

because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to use the implementation of JAVA remotely feature in

Villado et al with the system in Royce et al in view of Chen et al because network

monitoring is improved by enabling an authorized user to view communications

passing through a network in real time (Villado, paragraph 8).

Claims 50, 51, 58, and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Chen et al (US PGPUB US2004/0119736) in view of

Heidingsfeld et al (US Patent #6,823,359).

Claim 50 discloses the method of claim 49, wherein the web page

comprises code for causing the set of one or more pertinent events to be

registered. Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 49 as recited above. It

fails to teach the web page comprises code for causing the set of one or more

pertinent events to be registered. Heidingsfeld et al teaches the web page has

code to update information (column 2, lines 24-28).

Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both

related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of

ordinary skill in the art to use the web page code features in Heidingsfeld et al

with the system in Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without

additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2,

line 8).

Claim 51 discloses the method of claim 50, wherein the code is Javascript

code. Heidingsfeld et al further teaches the code used is Javascript (column 2,

lines 24-28).

Claim 58 discloses the apparatus of claim 57, wherein the web page comprises code for causing the set of one or more pertinent events to be registered. Chen et al teaches the limitations of claim 57 as recited above. It fails to teach the web page comprises code for causing the set of one or more pertinent events to be registered. Heidingsfeld et al teaches the web page has code to update information (column 2, lines 24-28).

Chen et al and Heidingsfeld et al are analogous art because they are both related to network monitoring.

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the web page code features in Heidingsfeld et al with the system in Chen et al because the data is able to be delivered without additional software or configuration (Heidingsfeld, column 1, line 61 – column 2, line 8).

Claim 59 discloses the apparatus of claim 58, wherein the code is Javascript code. Heidingsfeld et al further teaches the code used is Javascript (column 2, lines 24-28).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed August 23, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts the prior art does not disclose or suggest in response to detecting an event, interacting with a server to obtain a set of updated status information for a node. The Examiner respectfully disagrees, Chen et al teaches

if an event is detected and determined to be displayed the event is obtained by
the administrative workstation (Chen, paragraphs 21 and 22).

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection
presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**.
See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as
set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire
THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is
filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory
action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory
period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory
action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be
calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will
the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this
final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from
the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Gillis whose telephone number is
571-272-7952. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the
examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on 571-272-3880. The fax
phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is
assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from

the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information

for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public

PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through

Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-

direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-

free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service

Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-

9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian J Gillis
Examiner
Art Unit 2141

BJG
11/2/2007

JASON CARDONE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER